

1 [Parties and Counsel Listed on Signature Pages]  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 IN RE: SOCIAL MEDIA ADOLESCENT  
11 ADDICTION/PERSONAL INJURY PRODUCTS  
12 LIABILITY LITIGATION

This Document Relates To:

ALL ACTIONS

MDL No. 3047

Case No. 4:22-md-03047-YGR (PHK)

**AGENDA AND JOINT STATEMENT  
FOR NOVEMBER 22, 2024, CASE  
MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE**

Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

Magistrate Judge: Hon. Peter H. Kang

Pursuant to Case Management Order (“CMO”) No. 1 (ECF 75), the Parties submit this agenda and joint statement in advance of the November 22, 2024 Case Management Conference (“CMC”).

## I. Agenda for Case Management Conference

Pursuant to Case Management Order No. 18, the Parties offer the below agenda for the CMC scheduled for November 22, 2024:

- All Parties: So-ordering expert report certification language (*see infra* Section II)
- State AGs: State AG coalition leadership changes in Colorado
- PI/SD Plaintiffs: Plaintiffs’ request to narrow the pools of Personal Injury (“PI”) and School District (“SD”) bellwethers ahead of expert report submissions (*see infra* Section II)
- State AGs: Court’s orders regarding state agencies who were served Rule 45 subpoenas (*see infra* Section V(B))
- Montana AG and Meta: Procedure for addressing Montana AG Complaint in light of Court’s Order granting in part and denying in part Meta’s motion to dismiss the Multistate AG Complaint (ECF 1214) and Florida AG Complaint (ECF 1319). *See* ECF 1298 (Montana AG’s position statement); ECF 1301 (Meta’s position statement).
- PI/SD Plaintiffs, State AGs, and Meta: Meta’s Notice of Appeal of Motion to Dismiss Orders at ECF 1214 and 1267 (*see* ECF 1330)

## II. Joint Updates

Expert Certification. The Parties have agreed to the following certification language to be included in each expert report served in this case: “The undersigned hereby certifies their understanding that they owe a primary and overriding duty of candor and professional integrity to help the Court on matters within their expertise and in all submissions to, or testimony before, the Court. The undersigned further certifies that their report and opinions are not being presented for any improper purpose, such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation.” The Parties request that, at the CMC, the Court so-order inclusion of this certification language in expert reports.

Proposed Order re Stay of Claims Against Roblox and Discord. The PI Plaintiffs and Defendants refer the Court to ECF 1331 and request entry of the proposed order.

Website. In CMO 18, the Court observed that there is “currently no centralized party-run website” and requested that the “parties discuss whether the current approach is the best way to keep the public abreast of this MDL’s developments.” PI/SD Plaintiffs and Defendants have conferred and report that liaison counsel will work with BrownGreer to update and help it maintain its website about MDL 3047 with key dates and docket entries, located here:

<https://www.mdlcentrality.com/SocialMedia/IndexMDL>. PI/SD Plaintiffs and Defendants hope this website will be complementary to the already-robust website maintained by the Court. Should the Court wish, a link to this website could be added to the Court’s page about the litigation to facilitate public access.

Vendor Obligations. In CMO 18, the Court ordered the Parties to “confirm, consistent with this Court’s practice in class action cases, that their vendors will delete data subsequent to this MDL’s closure and ensure that at any time these vendors have not, are not, and will not use data disclosed to them for any other purpose beyond what is authorized pursuant to this litigation.” The Parties have reached out to each of their vendors reminding them of these obligations. Each vendor has responded confirming they understand and will abide by these obligations. During the last CMC, the Court also asked Plaintiffs to ensure that there are no “behind the scenes [issues] that should raise concerns” with their vendors, including potential conflicts of interest. 10/25/24 CMC Tr. 192:24-193:8. Plaintiffs’ leadership has reviewed their vendor list, made appropriate inquiries, and can confirm that, having conducted this additional diligence, they remain unaware of any such issues.

Potential Narrowing of Bellwether Discovery Pools Before Expert Disclosures. As previewed during the October 25, 2024 CMC (*see Hr’g Tr. 29:7-32:11*), the Parties have met and conferred regarding PI/SD Plaintiffs’ proposal for a selection process and timing to further narrow the PI and SD bellwether discovery pools before Plaintiffs’ expert reports are due. The Parties’ discussions are ongoing and they will report the outcome in the next CMC statement.

TikTok Defendants’ Administrative Motion re California Attorney General Action. On November 13, 2024, Defendants TikTok Inc., TikTok LLC, TikTok Ltd., ByteDance Inc., and ByteDance Ltd. (“TikTok Defendants”) and the additional entities TikTok U.S. Data Security Inc. and TikTok Pte. Ltd removed *The People of the State of California v. TikTok Inc.*, Case No. 5:24-cv-7942

(the “California Attorney General Action”) from the Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara to the Northern District of California. On November 14, the TikTok Defendants submitted an Administrative Motion pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-12 to request that the Court consider whether the California Attorney General Action should be related to this MDL. The case is presently assigned to Judge Eumi K. Lee. Any response to the TikTok Defendants’ motion must be filed by November 18.

### **III. Joint JCCP Update**

Pursuant to CMO 18, the Parties offer the following update on proceedings in the JCCP. On November 14, 2024, Judge Kuhl held a status conference to continue discussions regarding the status of bellwether-specific discovery and expert discovery schedule in the JCCP. The next Status Conference before Judge Kuhl will occur on December 9, 2024.

At the November conference, the Parties presented their proposed schedules for JCCP expert discovery and *Sargon* motions. After oral argument, Judge Kuhl took the issue of the expert schedules under submission.

The substantial completion deadline for bellwether-specific discovery was October 28, 2024. At the November 14 conference, the Parties presented their positions on each other’s substantial completion status for Judge Kuhl to consider. Judge Kuhl ordered each party to submit a report on November 19, 2024 outlining the outstanding productions related to the bellwether plaintiffs and deadlines for the completion of discovery.

JCCP bellwether depositions commence on December 3, 2024. The parties have cooperatively scheduled 56 depositions to take place between December 2024 and January 2025. Depositions of treaters continue to be scheduled.

Judge Kuhl further ruled that Defendants must provide Plaintiffs advance notice, at a general level and to the extent anticipated in advance, as to any depositions in which they believe questioning on any Plaintiffs’ sexual behavior, criminal history, or drug use will be necessary because it relates to the injuries or claims in the case. The parties are to meet and confer where necessary, and though Defendants are not required to disclose specific questions they may ask, if Plaintiffs believe questioning on these topics is improper, they may seek an order from the Court either prior to the deposition at issue if the topic was disclosed in advance or during the deposition if the topic was not disclosed in advance.

Pursuant to a prior ruling, the parties exchanged draft jury instructions on causation. The parties will file simultaneous briefs regarding the instructions on November 22, 2024 and the Court will hear oral argument on December 17, 2024.

#### **IV. Joint Discovery Update**

A copy of the Parties' joint Discovery Management Conference ("DMC") Statement for the November 23, 2024 DMC will be sent by email to Judge Gonzalez Rogers after it is filed.

#### **V. Plaintiffs' Additional Submission**

##### **A. PISD Ombudsperson**

In CMO 18, the Court requested that plaintiffs' leadership consider whether it would be useful to designate one plaintiff's counsel among leadership "who could serve as the point-person to receive any complaints from and among plaintiffs' counsel." Leadership is considering this suggestion and, per the Court's order, will "advise the Court of plaintiffs' perspective in advance of this year's reappointment requests."

##### **B. Court's Orders Regarding State Agencies Who Were Served Rule 45 Subpoenas**

###### *State AGs' Position:*

The State AGs seek clarification regarding the interplay of this Court's October 30 Order reinstating Rule 45 subpoenas (ECF 1292) and Magistrate Judge Kang's subsequent Discovery Management Order regarding search terms, custodians, and litigation holds (ECF 1299). Contrary to Meta's suggestions, the State AGs do not dispute that Magistrate Judge Kang has ordered that a set of state agencies are subject to party discovery (ECF 1117). Because the State AGs' request for clarification is narrow and does not seek to relitigate that issue, the State AGs refrain from belaboring the procedural history and arguments already set forth in the pending Motion for Relief from that order (ECF 1168).

Following the Case Management Conference on October 25, 2024, this Court entered an Order (ECF 1292) reinstating the Rule 45 subpoenas Meta issued to certain state agencies and directing Meta and the AGs to "immediately resume and continue document productions" based on those Rule 45 subpoenas. The Court clarified that "to the extent Rule 45 subpoenas were not issued, the parties shall

1 comply with Magistrate Judge Kang’s orders regarding timing and procedures to complete this  
2 discovery, including finalizing relevant custodians, search terms, and the scope of relevant documents.”

3 Two days later, Magistrate Judge Kang also entered Discovery Management Order 11, which  
4 more generally orders various State AGs to identify search terms and custodians for their state agencies  
5 and engage in meet and confers with Meta about the same, and orders the remaining State AGs who had  
6 already been conferring with Meta regarding search terms and custodians to continue to do so (ECF  
7 1299). The State AGs and Meta have conferred about the interplay of these orders on multiple occasions  
8 and have different interpretations regarding the obligations these Orders, when read together, impose on  
9 the state agencies who have received Rule 45 subpoenas from Meta. Meta insists that, despite this  
10 Court’s Order, the State AGs are still required to engage in search term and custodian negotiations  
11 pursuant to Magistrate Judge Kang’s subsequent order for agencies who received Rule 45 subpoenas,  
12 essentially starting from scratch and duplicating those agencies’ efforts to identify and produce  
13 responsive documents. The State AGs disagree; Meta’s position essentially renders this Court’s October  
14 30 Order meaningless. Rather than expedite production from the state agencies who have already begun  
15 production efforts under Rule 45, Meta’s suggestion that Rule 45 efforts and RFP negotiations under  
16 party discovery parameters would proceed in parallel would introduce unnecessary delay and  
17 duplication. While Meta is correct that some State AGs and agencies have proposed search terms and  
18 custodians for agencies who have received Rule 45 subpoenas, those proposals have been made with all  
19 reservations of rights regarding the effect of this Court’s October 30 Order. Moreover, Meta’s position  
20 in negotiations with the State AGs regarding search terms and custodians has been largely intractable:  
21 contrary to Meta’s representations that it is working collaboratively with the State AGs to identify  
22 methods by which discovery of state agencies can be narrowly tailored, the State AGs’ suggestions,  
23 including “go get ‘em” requests, tailored searches and/or custodians that account for agencies’ efforts to  
24 date in response to Rule 45 subpoenas, identifying categories of documents unlikely to yield relevant  
25 information, and de-prioritizing agencies that are unlikely to possess responsive material, have been  
26 largely met with Meta’s refusal to consider such options and insistence on implementation of a  
27 boilerplate list of broad search terms and threats that failure to acquiesce to Meta’s demands will lead to  
28 immediate briefing before the Magistrate Judge. Meta’s position is at odds with this Court’s clear

1 directive to move forward with search terms and custodians “to the extent Rule 45 subpoenas *were not*  
 2 *issued*” and instruction to Meta to “not unilaterally cease ongoing negotiations with agencies during the  
 3 pendency of this Court’s review.” (Emphasis added.)

4 To facilitate efficient and expeditious progress on this issue, the State AGs seek clarification  
 5 from this Court regarding its Order and whether production according with Meta’s Rule 45 subpoenas is  
 6 intended to take place in lieu of producing in response to Meta’s requests for production under Rule 34  
 7 for the agencies in receipt of such a Rule 45 subpoena.

8 *Meta’s Position:*

9 The Court’s orders are clear, and the States AGs are creating inefficiencies and additional  
 10 burdens by suggesting otherwise. Pursuant to Judge Kang’s orders, most States have agreed to utilize  
 11 search terms and custodians for many of their agencies (including at least some of their subpoenaed  
 12 agencies), and Meta already is conferring with States about how to expedite productions, including  
 13 through “go get ‘em” requests, tailored searches and/or custodians that account for any efforts the  
 14 agency already has undertaken to locate potentially responsive material, identifying categories of  
 15 documents that would not need to be searched, and de-prioritizing agencies that are unlikely to possess  
 16 responsive material, and the like. Under the guise of seeking to clarify an order that is clear, the States  
 17 seek to disrupt this process, and partially abrogate Judge Kang’s well-reasoned, 248-page order largely  
 18 permitting Meta to seek party discovery of state agency files, so that discovery against agencies that  
 19 Meta subpoenaed would have to proceed alternatively on a separate track rather than in parallel with  
 20 other agency discovery. This Court’s October 30 order explicitly states that Judge Kang’s order “is not  
 21 stayed” while the Court considers the States’ objections. ECF No. 1292. The States should not be able  
 22 to supplant Judge Kang’s order through a purported need for “clarification.”

23 As background, Meta originally sought state agency discovery from the States in February 2024,  
 24 and when the State refused, promptly moved to compel. During the pendency of that motion, at Judge  
 25 Kang’s suggestion and to keep discovery moving forward, Meta began subpoenaing state agencies  
 26 common across states (e.g., Departments of Education and Health), without waiving any rights to seek  
 27 such discovery from the States should Judge Kang grant Meta’s motion to compel. While that subpoena  
 28 process was still in its nascent stages—fewer than half contacted Meta about the subpoenas, many

simply to request deadline extensions—and notwithstanding the States’ claims that the subpoenas rendered Meta’s motion to compel moot, on September 6, 2024, Judge Kang largely granted Meta’s motion “to compel the State Plaintiffs to include their identified state agencies within the scope of party discovery” under FRCP 34. ECF No. 1117 at 2.

In his September 6, 2024 order, Judge Kang also expressed views on the inefficiencies inherent in a process that would require Meta to subpoena the at-issue state agencies. According to Judge Kang, “requiring a party (like . . . Meta here) to serve subpoenas on different state agencies who could then assert different (even contradictory) arguments against the subpoenas, where there is a demonstrable and legal basis for finding control, is not conducive to the just and efficient administration of justice.” ECF No. 1117 at 41. Judge Kang has since repeatedly confirmed that all state agency discovery, including of subpoenaed agencies, should be coordinated with the State AG. See, e.g., ECF No. 1299 (directing the parties to “cooperate and coordinate” conferral scheduling “instead of requiring Meta to schedule and conduct hundreds of separate meet and confers across all of the agencies.”). This Court has as well. See ECF No. 1292 (“The AGs shall facilitate productions for and negotiations on behalf of the agencies in their respective states”).

The States now seek “clarification” about whether anything in this Court’s October 30, 2024 order was “intended to take place in lieu of producing in response to Meta’s requests for production under Rule 34 for the agencies in receipt of such a Rule 45 subpoena.” No clarification is needed. The third sentence of this Court’s order expressly states that Judge Kang’s September 6 order permitting state agency discovery via Rule 34 “(Dkt. No. 1117) is not stayed” while this Court considers the States’ objections. ECF No. 1292 (emphasis added). That means Meta should be able to continue to proceed with state agency discovery through Rule 34 for all covered agencies.

To be clear, Meta gives the portion of this Court’s October 30, 2024 order concerning Rule 45 subpoenas meaning: that Meta is pursuing Rule 34 discovery against the agencies, to “expedite productions,” agencies who also received a subpoena should “continue document productions based on the contents and responses to those Rule 45 subpoenas.” ECF No. 1292. But there is nothing in this Court’s order, or Judge Kang’s subsequently-issued order concerning how agency discovery should proceed (ECF No. 1299), indicating that the Rule 45 subpoenas should displace—rather than operate in

1 parallel with—the party discovery process against those same agencies, including Meta’s ongoing  
2 discussions with those agencies about appropriate search terms and custodians.

3 The States argue that Meta’s view means that the subpoenaed agencies would be “starting from  
4 scratch” and have to “duplicat[e]” prior efforts. Not true. First, most of the subpoenaed agencies would  
5 be “starting from scratch” or nearly from scratch either way. Prior to October 30, 2024, less than one-  
6 third of the subpoenaed agencies had produced anything to Meta. Of those agency productions, more  
7 than one-quarter contained fewer than 10 documents. And for about 15 States, Meta received no  
8 documents from any subpoenaed agency. Second, in conferrals concerning the handful of subpoenaed  
9 agencies who produced documents, Meta has routinely asked for information about those agencies’  
10 search processes to assess tailoring any additional searches to avoid unnecessary duplication, and  
11 discussed other ways of streamlining discovery, including the use of “go get ‘em” requests.

12 In addition to being contrary to this Court’s express statement that Judge Kang’s order on agency  
13 discovery “is not stayed,” the States’ view accomplishes little but create inefficiencies. The vast  
14 majority of States already have committed to utilizing search terms and custodians for some or all of the  
15 agencies that Meta subpoenaed, and are having ongoing conferrals with Meta about the parameters of  
16 those searches. Of the remaining minority of States who have taken the position that they should be  
17 excused from proposing search terms and custodians for subpoenaed agencies in light of this Court’s  
18 October 30, 2024 order, all but three were expressly directed by Judge Kang’s October 29 and  
19 November 1 orders to propose terms and custodians by November 1 (ECF Nos. 1291, 1299), and yet did  
20 not comply with that Court order. Changing the process that most States have agreed to undertake to  
21 implement Judge Kang’s September 6 order would only add more hurdles to an “[e]fficient resolution of  
22 the issues.” ECF No. 1292.

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 Respectfully submitted,

2 DATED: November 15, 2024

3 By: /s/ Previn Warren

4  
5  
6  
7  
LEXI J. HAZAM  
**LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &**  
**BERNSTEIN, LLP**  
275 BATTERY STREET, 29TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3339  
Telephone: 415-956-1000  
lhazam@lchb.com

8  
9  
10  
11  
PREVIN WARREN  
**MOTLEY RICE LLC**  
401 9th Street NW Suite 630  
Washington DC 20004  
Telephone: 202-386-9610  
pwarren@motleyrice.com

12 Co-Lead Counsel

13  
14  
15  
16  
CHRISTOPHER A. SEEGER  
**SEEGER WEISS, LLP**  
55 CHALLENGER ROAD, 6TH FLOOR  
RIDGEFIELD PARK, NJ 07660  
Telephone: 973-639-9100  
cseeger@seegerweiss.com

17 Counsel to Co-Lead Counsel

18  
19  
20  
21  
JENNIE LEE ANDERSON  
**ANDRUS ANDERSON, LLP**  
155 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 900  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104  
Telephone: 415-986-1400  
jennie@andrusanderson.com

22 Liaison Counsel

23  
24  
25  
26  
EMILY C. JEFFCOTT  
**MORGAN & MORGAN**  
633 WEST FIFTH STREET, SUITE 2652  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071  
Telephone: 213-787-8590  
ejeffcott@forthepeople.com

27  
28 JOSEPH VANZANDT  
**BEASLEY ALLEN**

1                   234 COMMERCE STREET  
2                   MONTGOMERY, LA 36103  
3                   Telephone: 334-269-2343  
joseph.vanzandt@beasleyallen.com

4                   Federal/State Liaisons

5                   MATTHEW BERGMAN  
6                   GLENN DRAPER  
7                   **SOCIAL MEDIA VICTIMS LAW CENTER**  
8                   821 SECOND AVENUE, SUITE 2100  
SEATTLE, WA 98104  
Telephone: 206-741-4862  
matt@socialmediavictims.org  
glenn@socialmediavictims.org

10                  JAMES J. BILSBORROW  
**WEITZ & LUXENBERG, PC**  
700 BROADWAY  
NEW YORK, NY 10003  
Telephone: 212-558-5500  
jbilsborrow@weitzlux.com

14                  JAYNE CONROY  
**SIMMONS HANLY CONROY, LLC**  
112 MADISON AVE, 7TH FLOOR  
NEW YORK, NY 10016  
Telephone: 917-882-5522  
jconroy@simmonsfirm.com

18                  ANDRE MURA  
**GIBBS LAW GROUP, LLP**  
1111 BROADWAY, SUITE 2100  
OAKLAND, CA 94607  
Telephone: 510-350-9717  
amm@classlawgroup.com

22                  ALEXANDRA WALSH  
**WALSH LAW**  
1050 Connecticut Ave, NW, Suite 500  
Washington D.C. 20036  
Telephone: 202-780-3014  
awalsh@alexwalshlaw.com

27                  MICHAEL M. WEINKOWITZ  
**LEVIN SEDRAN & BERMAN, LLP**  
510 WALNUT STREET  
SUITE 500

1 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19106  
2 Telephone: 215-592-1500  
3 mweinkowitz@lfsbalw.com

4 Plaintiffs' Steering Committee Leadership

5 RON AUSTIN  
6 **RON AUSTIN LAW**  
7 400 MANHATTAN BLVD.  
8 HARVEY, LA 70058  
Telephone: 504-227-8100  
raustin@ronaustinlaw.com

9 PAIGE BOLDT  
10 **WALSH LAW**  
11 4 Dominion Drive, Bldg. 3, Suite 100  
San Antonio, TX 78257  
Telephone: 210-448-0500  
PBoldt@alexwalshlaw.com

12 THOMAS P. CARTMELL  
13 **WAGSTAFF & CARTMELL LLP**  
14 4740 Grand Avenue, Suite 300  
15 Kansas City, MO 64112  
Telephone: 816-701-1100  
tcartmell@wccllp.com

16 SARAH EMERY  
17 **HENDY JOHNSON VAUGHN EMERY PSC**  
18 600 WEST MAIN STREET, SUITE 100  
19 LOUISVILLE, KT 40202  
Telephone: 859-600-6725  
semery@justicestartshere.com

20 CARRIE GOLDBERG  
21 **C.A. GOLDBERG, PLLC**  
22 16 Court St.  
23 Brooklyn, NY 11241  
Telephone: 646-666-8908  
carrie@cagoldberglaw.com

24 RONALD E. JOHNSON, JR.  
25 **HENDY JOHNSON VAUGHN EMERY PSC**  
26 600 WEST MAIN STREET, SUITE 100  
27 LOUISVILLE, KT 40202  
Telephone: 859-578-4444  
rjohnson@justicestartshere.com

1 SIN-TING MARY LIU  
2 **AYLSTOCK WITKIN KREIS &**  
3 **OVERHOLTZ, PLLC**  
4 17 EAST MAIN STREET, SUITE 200  
PENSACOLA, FL 32502  
Telephone: 510-698-9566  
mliu@awkolaw.com

5  
6 JAMES MARSH  
7 **MARSH LAW FIRM PLLC**  
8 31 HUDSON YARDS, 11TH FLOOR  
NEW YORK, NY 10001-2170  
Telephone: 212-372-3030  
jamesmarsh@marshlaw.com

9  
10 JOSEPH E. MELTER  
11 **KESSLER TOPAZ MELTZER & CHECK LLP**  
12 280 KING OF PRUSSIA ROAD  
RADNOR, PA 19087  
Telephone: 610-667-7706  
jmeltzer@ktmc.com

13  
14 HILLARY NAPPI  
15 **HACH & ROSE LLP**  
16 112 Madison Avenue, 10th Floor  
New York, New York 10016  
Telephone: 212-213-8311  
hnappi@hrsclaw.com

17  
18 EMMIE PAULOS  
19 **LEVIN PAPANTONIO RAFFERTY**  
20 316 SOUTH BAYLEN STREET, SUITE 600  
PENSACOLA, FL 32502  
Telephone: 850-435-7107  
epaulos@levinlaw.com

21  
22 RUTH THI RIZKALLA  
23 **THE CARLSON LAW FIRM, PC**  
24 1500 ROSECRANS AVE., STE. 500  
MANHATTAN BEACH, CA 90266  
Telephone: 415-308-1915  
rrizkalla@carlsonattorneys.com

25  
26 ROLAND TELLIS  
27 DAVID FERNANDES  
28 **BARON & BUDD, P.C.**  
15910 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 1600  
Encino, CA 91436

1 Telephone: 818-839-2333  
2 rtellis@baronbudd.com  
3 dfernandes@baronbudd.com

4 MELISSA YEATES  
5 **KESSLER TOPAZ MELTZER & CHECK LLP**  
6 280 KING OF PRUSSIA ROAD  
7 RADNOR, PA 19087  
8 Telephone: 610-667-7706  
9 myeates@ktmc.com

10 DIANDRA "FU" DEBROSSE ZIMMERMANN  
11 **DICELLO LEVITT**  
12 505 20th St North  
13 Suite 1500  
14 Birmingham, Alabama 35203  
15 Telephone: 205-855-5700  
16 fu@dicellosevitt.com

17 Plaintiffs' Steering Committee Membership

18 *Attorneys for Individual Plaintiffs*

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 **PHILIP J. WEISER**  
2 Attorney General  
3 State of Colorado

4 /s/ Bianca E. Miyata  
5 Bianca E. Miyata, CO Reg. No. 42012,  
6 *pro hac vice*  
7 Senior Assistant Attorney General  
8 Lauren M. Dickey, CO Reg. No. 45773, *pro hac vice*  
9 First Assistant Attorney General  
10 Elizabeth Orem, CO Reg. No. 58309  
11 Assistant Attorney General  
12 Colorado Department of Law  
13 Ralph L. Carr Judicial Center  
14 Consumer Protection Section  
15 1300 Broadway, 7th Floor  
16 Denver, CO 80203  
17 Phone: (720) 508-6651  
18 bianca.miyata@coag.gov

19 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Colorado, ex rel.*  
20 *Philip J. Weiser, Attorney General*

21 **ROB BONTA**  
22 Attorney General  
23 State of California

24 /s/ Megan O'Neill  
25 Nicklas A. Akers (CA SBN 211222)  
26 Senior Assistant Attorney General  
27 Bernard Eskandari (SBN 244395)  
28 Emily Kalanithi (SBN 256972)  
Supervising Deputy Attorneys General  
Nayha Arora (CA SBN 350467)  
Megan O'Neill (CA SBN 343535)  
Joshua Olszewski-Jubelirer (CA SBN 336428)  
Marissa Roy (CA SBN 318773)  
Brendan Ruddy (CA SBN 297896)  
Deputy Attorneys General  
California Department of Justice  
Office of the Attorney General  
455 Golden Gate Ave., Suite 11000  
San Francisco, CA 94102-7004  
Phone: (415) 510-4400  
Fax: (415) 703-5480  
Megan.O'Neill@doj.ca.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff the People of the State of California*

**RUSSELL COLEMAN**  
Attorney General  
Commonwealth of Kentucky

*/s/ Daniel Keiser*

---

J. Christian Lewis (KY Bar No. 87109),  
*Pro hac vice*

Philip Heleringer (KY Bar No. 96748),  
*Pro hac vice*

Zachary Richards (KY Bar No. 99209),  
*Pro hac vice*

Daniel I. Keiser (KY Bar No. 100264),  
*Pro hac vice*

Matthew Cocanougher (KY Bar No. 94292),  
*Pro hac vice*

Assistant Attorneys General  
1024 Capital Center Drive, Suite 200  
Frankfort, KY 40601  
[CHRISTIAN.LEWIS@KY.GOV](mailto:CHRISTIAN.LEWIS@KY.GOV)  
[PHILIP.HELERINGER@KY.GOV](mailto:PHILIP.HELERINGER@KY.GOV)  
[ZACH.RICHARDS@KY.GOV](mailto:ZACH.RICHARDS@KY.GOV)  
[DANIEL.KEISER@KY.GOV](mailto:DANIEL.KEISER@KY.GOV)  
[MATTHEW.COCANOUGHER@KY.GOV](mailto:MATTHEW.COCANOUGHER@KY.GOV)  
Phone: (502) 696-5300  
Fax: (502) 564-2698

*Attorneys for Plaintiff the Commonwealth of Kentucky*

**MATTHEW J. PLATKIN**  
Attorney General  
State of New Jersey

/s/ Thomas Huynh  
Kashif T. Chand (NJ Bar No. 016752008),  
*Pro hac vice*  
Section Chief, Deputy Attorney General  
Thomas Huynh (NJ Bar No. 200942017),  
*Pro hac vice*  
Assistant Section Chief, Deputy Attorney General  
Verna J. Pradaxay (NJ Bar No. 335822021),  
*Pro hac vice*  
Mandy K. Wang (NJ Bar No. 373452021),  
*Pro hac vice*  
Deputy Attorneys General

1                   New Jersey Office of the Attorney General,  
2                   Division of Law  
3                   124 Halsey Street, 5th Floor  
4                   Newark, NJ 07101  
5                   Tel: (973) 648-2052  
6                   Kashif.Chand@law.njoag.gov  
7                   Thomas.Huynh@law.njoag.gov  
8                   Verna.Pradaxay@law.njoag.gov  
9                   Mandy.Wang@law.njoag.gov

10                  *Attorneys for Plaintiffs New Jersey Attorney General  
11                  and the New Jersey Division of Consumer Affairs  
12                  Matthew J. Platkin, Attorney General for the State of  
13                  New Jersey, and Cari Fais, Acting Director of the New  
14                  Jersey Division of Consumer Affairs*

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP  
2

3 By: /s/ Ashley M. Simonsen  
4 Ashley M. Simonsen, SBN 275203  
5 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP  
6 1999 Avenue of the Stars  
7 Los Angeles, CA 90067  
8 Telephone: (424) 332-4800  
9 Facsimile: + 1 (424) 332-4749  
10 Email: asimonsen@cov.com

11 Phyllis A. Jones, *pro hac vice*  
12 Paul W. Schmidt, *pro hac vice*  
13 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP  
14 One City Center  
15 850 Tenth Street, NW  
16 Washington, DC 20001-4956  
17 Telephone: + 1 (202) 662-6000  
18 Facsimile: + 1 (202) 662-6291  
19 Email: pajones@cov.com

20 *Attorney for Defendants Meta Platforms, Inc.*  
21 *f/k/a Facebook, Inc.; Facebook Holdings,*  
22 *LLC; Facebook Operations, LLC; Facebook*  
23 *Payments, Inc.; Facebook Technologies, LLC;*  
24 *Instagram, LLC; Siculus, Inc.; and Mark Elliot*  
25 *Zuckerberg*

26 KING & SPALDING LLP  
27

28 By: /s/ Geoffrey M. Drake  
29 Geoffrey M. Drake, *pro hac vice*  
30 TaCara D. Harris, *pro hac vice*  
31 1180 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 1600  
32 Atlanta, GA 30309-3521  
33 Telephone: (404) 572-4600  
34 Facsimile: (404) 572-5100  
35 Email: gdrake@kslaw.com  
36 tharris@kslaw.com

37 Kristen R. Fournier, *pro hac vice*  
38 KING & SPALDING LLP  
39 1185 Avenue of the Americas, 34th Floor  
40 New York, NY 10036-2601  
41 Telephone: (212) 556-2100  
42 Facsimile: (212) 556-2222  
43 Email: kfournier@kslaw.com  
44 David P. Mattern, *pro hac vice*

1 KING & SPALDING LLP  
2 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 900  
3 Washington, DC 20006-4707  
4 Telephone: (202) 737-0500  
Facsimile: (202) 626-3737  
Email: dmattern@kslaw.com

5 Bailey J. Langner (SBN 307753)  
6 KING & SPALDING LLP  
7 50 California Street, Suite 3300  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 318-1200  
Facsimile: (415) 318-1300  
Email: blangner@kslaw.com

10 Andrea Roberts Pierson, *pro hac vice*  
FAEGRE DRINKER LLP  
11 300 N. Meridian Street, Suite 2500  
Indianapolis, IN 46204  
12 Telephone: + 1 (317) 237-0300  
Facsimile: + 1 (317) 237-1000  
Email: andrea.pierson@faegredrinker.com

14 Amy R. Fiterman, *pro hac vice*  
FAEGRE DRINKER LLP  
15 2200 Wells Fargo Center  
90 South Seventh Street  
16 Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Telephone: +1 (612) 766-7768  
Facsimile: +1 (612) 766-1600  
Email: amy.fiterman@faegredrinker.com

19 *Attorneys for Defendants TikTok Inc., ByteDance Inc.,  
TikTok Ltd., ByteDance Ltd., and TikTok LLC*

22 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP  
By: /s/ Jonathan H. Blavin  
23 Jonathan H. Blavin, SBN 230269  
MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP  
24 560 Mission Street, 27th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105-3089  
25 Telephone: (415) 512-4000  
Facsimile: (415) 512-4077  
Email: jonathan.blavin@mto.com

27 Rose L. Ehler (SBN 29652)  
28 Victoria A. Degtyareva (SBN 284199)

1 Laura M. Lopez, (SBN 313450)  
2 Ariel T. Teshuva (SBN 324238)  
3 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP  
4 350 South Grand Avenue, 50th Floor  
5 Los Angeles, CA 90071-3426  
6 Telephone: (213) 683-9100  
7 Facsimile: (213) 687-3702  
8 Email: rose.ehler@mto.com  
9 Email: victoria.degyareva@mto.com  
10 Email: Ariel.Teshuva@mto.com

11 Lauren A. Bell (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)  
12 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP  
13 601 Massachusetts Ave., NW St.,  
14 Suite 500 E  
15 Washington, D.C. 20001-5369  
16 Telephone: (202) 220-1100  
17 Facsimile: (202) 220-2300  
18 Email: lauren.bell@mto.com

19 *Attorneys for Defendant Snap Inc.*

20 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
21 Professional Corporation  
22 By: /s/ Brian M. Willen  
23 Brian M. Willen (*pro hac vice*)  
24 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
25 1301 Avenue of the Americas, 40th Floor  
26 New York, New York 10019  
27 Telephone: (212) 999-5800  
28 Facsimile: (212) 999-5899  
Email: bwillen@wsgr.com

20 Lauren Gallo White (SBN 309075)  
21 Samantha A. Machock (SBN 298852)  
22 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
23 One Market Plaza, Spear Tower, Suite 3300  
24 San Francisco, CA 94105  
25 Telephone: (415) 947-2000  
26 Facsimile: (415) 947-2099  
27 Email: lwhite@wsgr.com  
28 Email: smachock@wsgr.com

26 Christopher Chiou (SBN 233587)  
27 Matthew K. Donohue (SBN 302144)  
28 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
953 East Third Street, Suite 100  
Los Angeles, CA 90013

1 Telephone: (323) 210-2900  
2 Facsimile: (866) 974-7329  
3 Email: cchiou@wsgr.com  
Email: mdonohue@wsgr.com

4 *Attorneys for Defendants YouTube, LLC and Google*  
5 *LLC*

6 WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP  
7 By: /s/ *Joseph G. Petrosinelli*  
Joseph G. Petrosinelli (*pro hac vice*)  
jpetrosinelli@wc.com  
8 Ashley W. Hardin (*pro hac vice*)  
ahardin@wc.com  
9 680 Maine Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20024  
10 Telephone.: 202-434-5000  
11 Fax: 202-434-5029

12 *Attorneys for Defendants YouTube, LLC and Google*  
13 *LLC*

14 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
15 By: /s/ Yarden R. Zwang-Weissman  
Yarden R. Zwang-Weissman (SBN 247111)  
16 300 South Grand Avenue, 22nd Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3132  
17 Tel.: 213.612.7238  
Email: yardena.zwang-weissman@morganlewis.com

18 Brian Ercole (*pro hac vice*)  
600 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1600  
19 Miami, FL 33131-3075  
20 Tel.: 305.415.3416  
Email: brian.ercole@morganlewis.com

22 Stephanie Schuster (*pro hac vice*)  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
23 NW Washington, DC 20004-2541  
Tel.: 202.373.6595  
24 Email: stephanie.schuster@morganlewis.com

25 *Attorneys for Defendants YouTube, LLC and Google*  
26 *LLC*

## ATTESTATION

I, Megan O'Neill, hereby attest, pursuant to N.D. Cal. Civil L.R. 5-1, that the concurrence to the filing of this document has been obtained from each signatory hereto.

Dated: November 15, 2024

By: /s/ Megan O'Neill